gallons of ethanol to equal the mileage you get with gasoline, that equals $6 a gallon that is mandated by the Congress of the United States for a product that not only is driving up the price of gasoline but is polluting our air, as identified by the Air Resources Board of California.

Now, if you are a constituent that is making money off of corn-based oil, that's fine. But do not allow anyone who claims to be an environmentalist and claims to be a consumer in California to support the corn-based ethanol proposal here.

I do not agree with Mr. MCCAIN of Arizona very often, but, as quoted by Mr. MCCAIN all the way back in 2003, he stated that the corn-based ethanol mandate that Congress is perpetuating on the United States is highway robbery perpetuated on the American people by Congress.

Please let's eliminate the corn-based mandate, save the environment, and save the consumers.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to concur with the statement from my colleague, Mr. BILBRAY, on his concerns because I share those concerns. It is not before our part of the legislation, but I do share many of the concerns he has raised from a California perspective by the mandate of ethanol.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on the Oversight and Government Reform sections of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the energy package before us today—H.R. 3221 and H.R. 2776—includes legislation passed by eleven House committees with the goals to address global warming and America's "energy independence."

H.R. 3221 includes bills I supported in the Energy and Commerce Committee on which I serve. The Energy and Commerce Committee bills will improve the Nation's energy efficiency, develop a "smart" electricity grid, improve the Department of Energy's Loan Guarantee program, increase the availability of renewable fuels, and encourage the development of advanced technology vehicles and components.

I do have reservations about Title VII, the Natural Resources Committee provisions, which would scale back and repeal several important provisions of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 that help encourage new domestic production of oil and natural gas.

While I have reservations with these provisions, I appreciate the efforts of House Leadership for bringing together several Members of Congress that represent energy-producing Districts to review and improve the legislation. While not perfect, we reduced agency timeframes to approve or reject drilling permits and coastal energy projects, as well as removed provisions that would delay energy corridors and eliminate the royalty-in-kind program.

While I intend to support H.R. 3221, I will oppose the Renewable Electricity Standard. We should encourage states to produce more electricity from renewable sources; the question is whether a "one-size-fits-all" Federal mandate is the best way to accomplish this goal, which could raise electricity rates for Texas consumers.

I will oppose H.R. 2776—a $15 billion tax package—because it includes additional provisions above those carefully negotiated in H.R. 6, the CLEAN Energy Act. While it includes important renewable energy provisions, we cannot keep taxing American's energy industry and expect to have adequate supplies of energy.

The Energy Information Administration predicts that natural gas, oil, and coal will compromise approximately the same share of our total energy supply in 2030 that they did in 2005, even with new investments in renewable sources of energy.

This large increase in new taxes targeted at the U.S. energy industry could reduce our Nation's energy security by discouraging new domestic oil and gas production, discouraging new investments in refinery capacity, and actually tilting the competitive playing field for global energy resources against U.S. based oil and gas companies.

As we move forward in this Congress, I hope the House of Representatives will address America's need to produce additional domestic energy, both conventional and renewable, to ensure the reliability and affordability of our Nation's critical energy supplies.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my concerns about the bill before us (H.R. 3221 and H.R. 2776). While there are a number of good provisions in the bill, including the incorporation of several renewable energy provisions from legislation that I have cosponsored, these bills also contain seriously objectionable provisions.

As a member of the House Renewable Energy Caucus I am supportive of many of the renewable energy provisions in the bill. I have been very supportive of securing funding for solar and hydrogen energy research nationally and in my congressional district.

I also believe that conservation is important and am pleased that several important conservation provisions are included in the bill. Certainly conservation remains an important part of meeting our future energy needs and energy independence. I am disappointed, however, that while pursuing conservation initiatives this bill takes unnecessary steps that hamper our Nation's domestic energy production.

I am disappointed that this bill not only does very little to enhance domestic energy production but is counterproductive in that it takes a number of steps that will raise the cost of energy on the American people and American businesses. One provision in the bill will cost Florida consumers alone, over $4 billion. Furthermore, through its restrictions and higher taxes on domestic production of fossil fuels, this bill will result in increased imports from overseas.

At this time when American consumers and businesses are being taxed due to higher energy prices the Democrat bill that is being brought to the House floor will actually exacerbate this problem. It is also troubling that the Democrats have denied Members of the House the opportunity to offer and discuss over 100 amendments that they filed to this bill. Furthermore, of the 23 amendments that were allowed to be considered under the Democrat rules only five of them were offered by Republicans. The American people deserve better.

This bill: Locks up additional reserves so that we cannot extract oil and natural gas;

Raises taxes on domestic energy suppliers—giving foreign oil and gas producers a competitive edge over U.S. producers; and

Raises the costs of all energy projects undertaken in this bill—costing billions of dollars—by applying Davis-Bacon wage requirements for any energy project undertaken through this bill.

Additional specific provisions in the bill that will do nothing to increase domestic energy supplies and in fact increase energy costs for the American people include:

A $15.3 billion in tax increase on domestic fossil fuel producers;

Sunsetting tax credits for refined coal at the end of 2008;

Banning natural gas drilling for 4.2 trillion cubic feet of natural gas in the Roan Plateau in Colorado;

Applying Davis-Bacon (union wage) requirements to all projects resulting from the tax credit bonds authorized under this bill—raising labor costs on such projects by 20 percent–30 percent;

Giving New York City $2 billion to use for any transportation project of their choosing—the Chairman of the Committee represents New York City;

Phasing out the tax credit for hybrid vehicles after more than 60,000 of them have been sold—discouraging further production and purchase of the most popular hybrid vehicles;

Raising taxes on oil and gas companies for the costs of oil and natural gas exploration;

Restricting the tax credit on biodiesel produced in the U.S.;

Creating a $1 billion foreign aid program for energy efficiency programs in developing countries;

Allowing individuals to sue the Federal Government for damages caused by global warming;

Giving bureaucrats a longer time period in which to approve oil and gas drilling permits;

Imposing Federal building energy codes on States;

Permanently authorizing the expenditure of $125 million a year for a grant program;

Creating a new global warming bureaucracy in the U.S. Department of State that will cost American taxpayers $750 million;

Putting the government in the role of picking winners and losers which leads to serious inefficiency;

Directing the U.S. Government to negotiate costly global warming treaties with developed countries—leaving developing countries like China and India free from such costly mandates on their competing industries;

Cutting $1.2 billion from agriculture producers and shifts it to already subsidized biodiesel companies;

Spending an unlimited amount of money on a cap-and-trade program whereby Federal agencies can purchase greenhouse gas emission offsets—already proven to be very expensive for consumers in Europe;

Making it more difficult to develop oil and gas on Federal lands by closing down Bureau of Land Management offices;

Slowing the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, tar sands leasing program; and

Including dozens of additional costly mandates on businesses and individuals that are essentially hidden taxes.

It is no wonder that this bill is opposed by a host of organizations, including businesses, seniors, and energy organizations. This bill